

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Connecticut has a short statement. I ask the Senator about how long?

Mr. DODD. About 5 minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut be recognized for his statement and then the Senator from Iowa and then the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for up to 10 minutes, the Senator from Iowa for up to 15 minutes, and the Senator from Illinois for up to 25 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Iowa.

NOMINATION OF JOHN BOLTON

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to take a couple of minutes to review for my colleagues what has transpired over the last several days on the pending matter of the nomination of John Bolton to be our ambassador to the United Nations.

I know there has been a lot of talk about whether goalposts have been moved in our efforts to resolve the outstanding matters concerning information which the Foreign Relations Committee seeks from the administration regarding the Bolton nomination, information that will not be shared with all Members of this body, but shared with the appropriate members of the Intelligence Committee and the chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

We have not been expanding the goalposts but, rather, shrinking them. I want to review what has happened since April 11, since the issue was first raised regarding the nomination of John Bolton.

There are two issues on which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee seeks additional information. One has to do with 10 intercepts involving the names of 19 Americans that Mr. Bolton sought as the Under Secretary of State. We have tried since April 11, since the issue was raised on April 11, to have the appropriate members of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Intelligence Committee review those intercepts, much as Mr. Bolton did. The administration has refused to allow that to occur.

I then offered as a counterproposal, rather than the appropriate members looking at the intercepts, that at least the names of people we believe may be on those requests from Mr. Bolton be sent down to the administration for them to review. If they are on the list, we would want to pursue that a bit further to find out why Mr. Bolton sought information about them. If they are not, then that would end the matter.

A second matter of equal importance is a request Senator BIDEN has made, and that has to do with draft testimony before the Congress regarding Syria and the possibility of weapons of

mass destruction being located in Syria.

Both requests are rather simple to comply with and should not take much time. But my colleagues on both sides ought to be aware that this is now a matter beyond the consideration of Mr. Bolton. Either the Senate has a right to receive pertinent and important information regarding this nomination or it does not.

Certainly my colleagues on both sides of the aisle know historically that other Members have sought information from other administrations they thought was critical to completing their task either on a matter of public policy or a nomination.

As I said earlier, we began on April 11. On April 14 of this year, questions were submitted. Again on April 22. On April 29, Senator BIDEN wrote to the administration requesting information regarding Syria.

On May 4, Senator LUGAR sent letters to Secretary Rice which implied that she need not comply with all of the requests but certainly some of them.

On May 18, Senator BIDEN sent a letter directly to Ambassador Negroponte requesting information regarding the intercepts; again on May 26, on June 1, on June 2, on June 3, on June 8, on June 9, and as late as today on June 14.

There has been a long effort to try and work out some compromise, including the request I made to Mr. Negroponte, to allow us to submit the names. If John Negroponte reported back that there was no correlation between those names and the intercepts sought by Mr. Bolton, then I was going to be satisfied with that answer.

It is ironic, in a way, that the administration is filibustering their own nominee.

I want to get to a vote on John Bolton. We can do it in 24 or 48 hours, in my view, by simply responding to the request we have made, in the modified form we have made it, and responding to Senator BIDEN's request regarding the testimony on Syria. Both of those matters have been sought now for almost 2 months, and yet the administration continues to stonewall on those two requests.

I think it is important that the Senate be heard on these matters. I think it is dangerous for us not to be. There is pertinent information that could relate to the decisions by Senators to vote for or against this nominee.

In short, we have reached out a hand of compromise to the administration. And in response, the administration has given us the back of theirs. They have given us nothing—no counteroffer, just more stonewalling.

It is rather ironic that it is the administration that is filibustering its own nominee.

As my colleagues are well aware, on May 26, just before the Memorial Day recess, the Senate, by a vote of 56 to 42, did not invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to a vote on the nomination of John Bolton to the position of

United States Representative to the United Nations.

The reason that the Senate did not invoke cloture was that sufficient numbers of our colleagues have supported the Foreign Relations Committee's efforts to make sure that all relevant information has been made available to the Senate related to this nomination before the Senate casts an up or down vote.

The administration has offered no rationale for refusing to provide the NSA intercepts or the information about the consultant. With regard to the Syria documents, it has argued that they are not relevant to our inquiry. In other words, the administration is telling the Senate what it may investigate. It has also said that providing the information will have a "chilling effect" on the deliberative process; yet the committee has already received numerous deliberative process materials.

The administration claims that they have already given the necessary information related to the intercepts request to the committee of jurisdiction, namely the Select Committee on Intelligence.

First, the Bolton nomination is within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee, not the Intelligence Committee.

Second, we know from Senators ROBERTS and ROCKEFELLER that General Hayden refused to provide them with the very names that Mr. Bolton and Mr. Bolton's staff were allowed to see.

Moreover, in a letter to the chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator ROCKEFELLER stated that Mr. Bolton may have shared the NSA intercepts with others at State without prior authorization from NSA.

So to be clear, Mr. Bolton was apparently free to share this unedited information with members of his staff, but the chairman and ranking members of the Intelligence and Foreign Relations Committees have been denied access to this same information.

I also want my colleagues to understand that the areas of inquiry that the committee is pursuing were not dreamt up by us last night or last week. The administration has been aware for some time what we were seeking and how strongly we felt about these materials being provided.

Let me lay out the chronology of our requests.

On April 11, during the first hearing on Mr. Bolton, that I first raised questions about the NSA intercepts.

On April 14, I submitted a question for the record inquiring about this issue.

On April 22, I sent a letter directly to the NSA requesting this information.

On April 29, Senator BIDEN sent a letter, which also requested the information related to Syria.

On May 4, Senator LUGAR sent a letter to Secretary Rice which implied that she should not feel obligated to respond to all of the Committee's requests.

On May 18, Senator BIDEN sent a letter directly to Ambassador Negroponte, our new Director of National Intelligence, requesting these NSA intercepts.

On May 26, he sent a second letter to Negroponte, again making the same request.

On June 1, I called Ambassador Negroponte to offer a proposal for resolving the intercept issue.

On June 2, I sent a letter to Ambassador Negroponte which laid out in writing the June 1 verbal proposal.

On June 3, Ambassador Negroponte called me to say, "no deal."

On June 8, Senator ROBERTS approached me and suggested that pursuing my idea of a giving a list of names to the administration might bear fruit. He also proposed a role for the Select Committee on Intelligence in the process. That seemed reasonable to me. After consultation with Senator BIDEN he did, too.

On June 9, Senator BIDEN and I sent a letter laying out our understanding on how names might be provided to the administration, and what the role for the chair and cochair might be in the process.

On June 14, Senator ROBERTS replied in writing to our letter saying he could not support our proposal. I would add that our colleague Senator ROCKEFELLER has said he believes our proposal is eminently reasonable.

Through all of this, no one from the White House has contacted me or my colleague Senator BIDEN to offer any proposal for moving this process along.

In short, the administration has made no effort to meet Senator BIDEN and me halfway or even one-quarter of the way. The answer is either no or even worse, silence.

I ask my colleagues: If there is nothing in all of these documents, why have they not been provided? If there is nothing in them, then surely, providing them would clear up some of our concerns rather quickly. And make it possible to move forward with an up or down vote on the nomination.

And so if there is culpability for the delay in the Senate's consideration of the Bolton nomination, that culpability rests with the Bush administration. They have the ability to unlock this nomination by cooperating with this Senate as they did during the consideration of nominations during President Bush's first term in office.

I stand ready to listen to any proposal from the administration to resolve this matter. I know my colleague Senator BIDEN does as well. But the institutional prerogatives of the Senate are at stake here, and I believe we have the responsibility of protecting those prerogatives for this Congress and future Congresses. I am pleased and grateful that sufficient numbers of our colleagues appear to feel the same way.

I hope all Senators, regardless of whether they believe John Bolton will be a great man at the United Nations or not, realize this is a matter of con-

stitutional equity. Either the Senate, as a coequal branch of Government, has the right to request and receive through appropriate Members and appropriate committees pertinent information relating to a critical nomination or not, and if we do not, then I think this body suffers in its ability to perform its constitutional duties.

That is what we are requesting. It can be satisfied in a matter of hours, and then the Senate, as a body, can vote up or down on John Bolton to send him to the U.N. or not send him to the U.N. But to stonewall this institution on information we have a right to receive I think is wrong and I think it jeopardizes the relationship between the Senate and the White House.

My hope is the White House will respond to the modified requests we have made so we can get about the business of voting on this nomination and moving to other matters before the Senate.

I thank my colleagues from Iowa and Illinois for being generous with their time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 15 minutes.

RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARD

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, this is, indeed, an exciting time and moment. We have an 8-billion-gallon national renewable fuel standard that is going to be part of the Senate Energy bill. A previous bill I sponsored with Senator LUGAR and 18 other Senators serves as much of the basis for what we now have before us. This amendment takes us a bold step closer to improving the Nation's energy security, domestic and farm economy, and our environment.

To say we have a growing problem with energy in this country is an understatement. Today, about 97 percent of our transportation fuel comes from oil, two-thirds of that from foreign sources. This excessive dependence on petroleum undermines our national security, as we all know, and it reeks havoc on consumers who are now dealing with record-high gasoline prices. Our policy today costs us jobs. There are 27,000 lost U.S. jobs for every \$1 billion in imported oil. Our present policy damages our environment with fully one-third of the greenhouse gases now coming from vehicle emissions alone.

And the truth is, the problem is not going away, it is only getting worse.

Right now we are importing 60 percent of our oil from foreign countries. That percent is expected to increase, not decrease, to about 70 percent by 2025.

According to the Natural Resources Defense Council, America spends \$200,000 per minute on foreign oil, or \$13 million an hour. And more than \$25 billion goes to the Persian Gulf imports alone. A study by the Department of Energy found that our dependency on oil from unsteady regimes outside our borders has cost the country an astonishing \$7 trillion over the last 30 years, measured in current dollars.

If these figures are not disturbing enough, here is one more. According to the National Defense Council Foundation, the economic penalties of America's oil dependence are between \$297 billion to \$304 billion annually.

The Institute for the Analysis of Global Security, using this data, calculated the hidden costs at the gas pump. Everyone thinks we are paying around—I heard my friend from New York say in New York the price of gas is \$2.25, in Iowa it is around \$2.03, \$2.05, and around here it is about \$2.10 a gallon. That is what we think we are paying. But the Institute for the Analysis of Global Security, using the data about the hidden costs, has determined that the real cost of a gallon of gas at the pump is more than \$7 a gallon. A typical tankful of gas really would cost more than \$140.

What are those hidden costs? Add up what we are spending in the military alone in the Mideast and you come pretty close to the figure.

We have a choice. We can stand by, feed our addiction to foreign oil, or we can make a decisive shift now toward clean domestic renewable fuels such as ethanol and biodiesel. This will allow us to wean the U.S. economy from its dangerous level of dependence on foreign oil that is a clear and present danger to our economy and national security.

The renewable fuels standard will more than double the amount of ethanol and biodiesel in our fuel supply by 2012. It will firmly commit our Nation to clean, secure, diversified sources of domestic energy, not in some distant future but immediately in the years ahead.

Domestic ethanol production grew 21 percent in 2004 to more than 3.4 billion gallons. I might just add, ethanol was introduced seamlessly in California and New York, where it helped to buffer rising crude oil prices.

I know my good friend from New York had to leave, but I have since found out that right now there are two large production ethanol plants planned for construction in the State of New York; two big ones, one that is 100 million gallons a year, the other a bit smaller, being constructed right now in New York and more to come online later on.

Why is that? Because the technology is developing at a rapid pace to produce ethanol, not just from corn or sugar but from underutilized materials such as cornstalks, wood waste, cellulosic material, all kinds of biomass feedstocks.

So what we are doing makes sense. With an 8-billion-gallon renewable fuels standard, we establish a strong floor for the time frame under consideration. The fact is, we will have no trouble whatsoever producing enough ethanol to meet this standard. As I said, the industry already has the capacity to produce nearly 4 billion gallons of ethanol a year.

I will be frank. A lot of this does come from my State of Iowa. We lead